THE HONORABLE JAMES L. ROBART 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT IN AND FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON 9 10 CHARA CURTIS, CYNTHIA ALDRICH, AND ALFRED 11 CURRIER, Cause No. 2:12-cv-00991-JLR 12 PLAINTIFFS, RESPONSE TO MOTION FOR SANCTIONS AND 13 **JUDGMENT** v. 14 15 **ILLUMINATION ARTS, INC.,** a Washington Corporation, ILLUMINATION ARTS PUBLISHING, LLC, a Washington 16 Limited Liability Company, JOHN M. THOMPSON and 17 KIMMIE LYNN THOMPSON, 18 DEFENDANTS. 19 Relief Requested I. 20 21 Defendants request the Court deny both the Motion for Sanctions and the Motion for 22 Judgment. 23 24 II. Statement of Facts 25 Defendants provided the bulk of the requested information to the Plaintiffs. *Thompson* 26 27 Decl. Defendants are still in the process of gathering information regarding Defendant Kim CONSOLIDATED RESPONSE TO MOTION FOR The Law Offices of Matthew R. King PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT Page | 1 1420 FIFTH AVENUE, SUITE 2200 SEATTLE, WA 98101 206-274-5303 FAX 206-274-5304

MRKING@MATTHEWRKING.COM

Thompson. *Thompson Decl.* Defendants have terminated the legal services of the Law Offices of Matthew R. King. *King Decl.* The Motion for Withdrawal is scheduled for September 13, 2013. *Docket.*

III. Statement of Issues

Whether sanctions should be denied as Defendants have not unduly resisted discovery.

IV. Evidence Relied Upon

In support of this motion, Defendants rely upon the following evidence:

- 1. The Pro Se Statement of John Thompson, with the exhibits attached thereto;¹
- 2. The pleadings and filings in this matter.

V. Authority and Argument

A. Sanctions are Not Appropriate

Defendants have not unduly resisted discovery. In fact, Defendants have provided Plaintiffs an opportunity to review all documents at Defendants' offices. *Thompson Decl.* The civil rules empower courts with the discretion to issue sanctions against a party for discovery abuses, the touchstone is that any sanctions be "just" and that must be related to the particular claim which was at issue in the order to provide discovery. Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(b)(2)(A); *Insurance Corp. of Ireland, Ltd. v. Compagnie des Bauxites de Guinee*, 456 U.S. 694, 707, 102 S.Ct. 2099, 2108, 72 L.Ed.2d 492 (1982).

RESPONSE TO MOTION FOR SANCTIONS AND JUDGMENT

Page | 2



¹ The Pro Se Defendants have drafted a statement and have requested they be filed along with this memorandum. The pro se filings have not been drafted by, nor have signed by Matthew King.

1

2

To determine whether a sanction is "just" a court should considered the relevant factors and whether the severity of the sanction is warranted by the conduct involved. *In re Rubin*, 769 F.2d 611 (9th Cir. 1985).

Here, Plaintiffs have had ample opportunity to go on-site and review all of Defendants' records. Under FRCP 34(B)(2)(b), the responding party must make the records available for inspection and copying. Here, Defendants have done just that. The burden is on the Plaintiffs to make arrangements for inspection and duplication. That has not occurred here.

Plaintiffs' motion should be denied; the Defendants have opened their business up to full inspection. The motion to compel is improper.

VI. Conclusion

Plaintiffs' motion should be denied. The Defendants have made available the records for inspection and copying, and are more than happy to allow inspection by counsel.

/s/

Dated this 26th day of August, 2013.

The Law Offices of Matthew R. King, PLLC

Matthew R. King, WSBA 31822 Attorney for Plaintiff/Respondent 1420 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2200 Seattle, WA 98101 206-274-5303

FAX 206-274-5304 mrking@matthewrking.com

RESPONSE TO MOTION FOR SANCTIONS AND JUDGMENT

Page | 3



1420 FIFTH AVENUE, SUITE 2200 SEATTLE, WA 98101 206-274-5303 FAX 206-274-5304 MRKING@MATTHEWRKING.COM

25

26

27

DECLARATION OF SERVICE

I, Matthew King, hereby declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington, that I caused a copy of this document to be e-filed with the United States District Court, Western District of Washington, as required by the Court Rules and served via United States District Court ECF to:

Amit D. Ranade Kurt E. Kruckeberg Hillis Clark Martin & Peterson, P.S. 1221 Second Avenue, Suite 500 Seattle, WA 98101-2925

on the 26th day of August, 2013.

Dated this 26th day of August, 2013 at SEATTLE, Washington.

The Law Offices of Matthew R. King, PLLC

/s/

Matthew R. King, WSBA 31822 Attorney for Plaintiff/Respondent 1420 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2200 Seattle, WA 98101 206-274-5303 FAX 206-274-5304 mrking@matthewrking.com

RESPONSE TO MOTION FOR SANCTIONS AND JUDGMENT

Page | 4

